

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12-14, 18, 22, and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,396,476 to Bradski et al. (hereinafter Bradski) in view of United States Patent Number 7,197,562 to Murtha et al. (hereinafter Murtha). Claims 5, 7, 17, 19, 21, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski in view of Murtha and in further view of United States Patent Number 6,664,990 to Bates et al. (hereinafter Bates).

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview of September 6, 2007. We discussed a proposed amendment intending to differentiate the pointing device events of the present invention from the projector device events disclosed in Murtha. Applicant agreed to submit the amendment for examination, and does so with this response.

#### Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12-14, 18, 22, and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Bradski in view of Murtha. Claims 5, 7, 17, 19, 21, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski in view of Murtha and in further view of Bates. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 with the limitation that buffered event quantities and buffered event types are buffered “pointing device” event quantities and types. The amendment is well supported by the specification. See page 9, ¶ 31, lines 6-8.

Neither Murtha nor Bradski teach “...feedback comprising a dialog listing the buffered pointing device event quantity and the buffered pointing device event type for the buffered pointing device events and pointing device events passed to a receiving process...” as claimed by the present invention. See claim 1 as amended. See also claims 10, 24, 25, and 27 as amended. Murtha teaches displaying a list of projector device events and sub-events. Murtha, col. 9, line 49 – col. 10, line 25, fig. 3, ref 64. Because Bradski and Murtha do not teach all of the limitations of claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27, Applicant submits that claims 1, 10, 24, 25, and 27 are allowable. Applicant further submits that claims 3-5, 7, 9, 12-14, 17-19, 21-23, and 26 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

#### Conclusion

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicant asserts that the application is in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the

rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Bruce R. Needham/

Bruce R. Needham

Reg. No. 56,421

Attorney for Applicant

Date: October 26, 2007  
8 East Broadway, Suite 600  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Telephone (801) 994-4646  
Fax (801) 531-1929